



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,775	07/02/2003	Kuo-Hsing Cheng	4728P042D	5019
8791 75	90 11/26/2004		EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN			HARRISON, CHANTE E	
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			2672	
			DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/612,775	CHENG ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Chante Harrison	2672			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SH THE - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tiply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) daled will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 July 2003</u> .					
2a)□	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17 is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 18-21 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.				
10)) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	-· · ·	` '			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) [] a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Stage			
-00						
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) 🔯 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)			
3) 🔯 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date 3/04 & 5/04.	Paper No(s)/Mail D				

Art Unit: 2672

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is responsive to communications: Preliminary Amendment, filed on 7/2/03.
- 2. Claims 18-21 are pending in the case. Claims 18-21 are independent claims. Claims 1-17 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vij Rajarajan et al, US 2002/0109704, 8/2002.

As per independent claim 18, Rajarajan discloses displaying (V, E) pairs on an initial V-E plain shown on a monitor screen to observe the said initial (V, E) pairs distributed condition, wherein said V indicates nodes an wherein said E indicates edges (i.e. displaying on a viewing surface the design model consisting of nodes and edges/arcs representing an integrated circuit (pp. 1, Para 2 & 3; pp. 3, Para 26); setting L nodes x W edges (V, E) pairs rectangle region to compose a block, wherein (i.e. projections represent the model elements, which include nodes and edges/arcs; projections have

Art Unit: 2672

coordinates such as x, y, height, width and z, specified by a bounding rectangle) (pp. 5, Para 41; pp. 10, Para 100); defining the more (V, E) pairs in said block to be displayed by the relatively high light intensity to the less (V, E) pairs in said block (i.e. interfaces/methods are provided to select groups of elements that include nodes and edges/arcs; interfaces are provided when hovering over elements; and hovering effects the highlight of elements by changing the hue of the elements) (pp. 7, Para 65 & 66; pp. 16, Para 176); and watching relatively large size of V-E plain or a whole V-E plain to said initial (V, E) plain on said monitor screen, wherein said exact (V, E) pairs positions still be held, thereby zooming in said V-E plain to watch detail local (V, E) pairs distributed condition, or zooming out to watch global (V, E) pairs distributed condition on said monitor screen (i.e. the graph surface and the projections of nodes and edges/arcs bounded by a rectangle may be zoomed) (pp. 6, Para 52; pp. 9, Para 87; pp. 16, Para 177).

Rajarajan fails to specifically disclose nodes represent components of said circuit, edges represent the nets of said circuits, and L and W are integers.

Rajarajan teaches nodes and edges/arcs are elements projected on a diagram having a type-specific behavior that is relative to the project type and the elements behavior is also type-specific (pp. 5, Para 45 & 47). Rajarajan further teaches the surface coordinate values are expressed in pixels (pp. 6, Para 53).

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate nodes representing components of said circuit and edges representing the nets of said circuits with the disclosure of Rajarajan because an integrated circuit design tool uses elements

Art Unit: 2672

to represent an electrical wiring system and an electrical wiring system includes components and nets corresponding to the components. Additionally it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to further incorporate L and W as integers with the disclosure of Rajarajan because pixels are linearly displaced and linear displacement represents integer values.

As per independent claim 19, defining the less (V, E) pairs in said block to be displayed by the relatively high light intensity to the more (V, E) pairs in said block (i.e. interfaces/methods are provided to select groups of elements that include nodes and edges/arcs; interfaces are provided when hovering/dragging/dropping/connecting elements; hovering is a means of selecting elements and it effects the highlight of elements by changing the hue of the elements; and when drawing fewer projections are visibly altered) (pp. 7, Para 65 & 66; pp. 8, Para 75; pp. 16, Para 176). The rationale applied in the rejection of claim 18 applies herein.

As per independent claim 20, the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 18 applies herein.

As per independent claim 21, the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 18 applies herein.

Art Unit: 2672

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chante Harrison whose telephone number is 703-305-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chante Harrison Examiner Art Unit 2672

Ceh November 19, 2004

PRIMARY EXAMINER